

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending in the application with claims 1-5 and 32-35 being independent. Claims 1-5 have been amended and new claims 40-49 have been added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 32-39.

Claims 1-9 and 18-31 have been rejected as being anticipated by Nakamura. In maintaining this rejection, the Examiner contends that the arguments filed September 15, 2003, were not persuasive since independent claims 1-5 did not recite that the SRAM and the switching elements are separate elements. In view of this contention, each of claims 1-5 has been amended to recite that the SRAM is electrically connected to the first and second switching elements and includes transistors distinct from the first and second switching elements. Support for this amendment may be found in the application at, for example, Fig. 3 and page 19, lines 16-20.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims depending from claim 1 because Nakamura fails to describe or suggest a SRAM that is electrically connected to first and second switching elements and includes transistors distinct from the first and second switching elements. Instead, Nakamura describes a SRAM 14 that includes a memory cell 14a having a flip-flop with at least two transistors, the outputs of which are connected, respectively, to mirror electrodes 15 and 16.

In the rejection, the Examiner has indicated that the first and second switching elements may correspond to the transistors in a memory cell 14a of the SRAM 14. However, mapping of Nakamura to the claims in this way would not leave a SRAM having transistors distinct from the switching elements and connected in the manner recited in claim 1. Moreover, while Nakamura states that the memory cell 14a includes "at least two transistors," such that there could be transistors in addition to the two that the Examiner has indicated correspond to the switching elements, nothing in Nakamura describes or suggests how those additional transistors could constitute a SRAM connected in the manner recited in claim 1. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Applicant : Yamazaki, et al.
Serial No. : 09/903,783
Filed : July 11, 2001
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-281001 / US5070/5076

Each of independent claims 2-5 recites the same arrangement of switching elements and a SRAM as is recited in claim 1. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-5 and the claims depending from them for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 10-17 have been rejected as being obvious over Nakamura in view of Maimon. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Maimon does not remedy the failure of Nakamura to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Enclosed is a \$290 check (\$180 for excess claim fees and \$110 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Date: February 26, 2004

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40200380.doc